DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 952 SP 015 018

AUTHOR Yarger, Sam J.; Mertens, Sally K.
TITLE Documenting Teacher Centers--Report of a Field Test.
INSTITUTION Syracuse Area Teacher Center, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 95p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; *Data Collection; *Documentation; *Field Interviews; *Information Seeking; Program Development; *Questioning Techniques; Questionnaires; Surveys; *Teacher Centers
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Centers Program

ABSTRACT

The decision to document the development of the Teacher Centers Program failed to specify either the content or the process for documentation activities. The described field test was undertaken to determine which of two information-gathering strategies was the most effective--mailed questionnaire or telephone interview. While both methods produced good results it was determined that the telephone interview was the quickest and most fruitful method of the two. Appended to this report are samples of questions asked in the field test and the tabular results. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180952

OCT 10 11 07 AM '79

DOCUMENTING TEACHER CENTERS--
REPORT OF A FIELD TEST

SAM J. YARGER SALLY K. MERTENS

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

AUGUST 1979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sam Yarger
Sally K. Mertens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SYRACUSE AREA TEACHER CENTER

SP 015 018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
DESIGN FOR THE FIELD TEST	2
Training of Interviewers	3
WHAT WAS LEARNED ABOUT THE DOCUMENTATION STRATEGIES	6
Participant Perceptions of Documentation and the Field-Test Strategies	7
Telephone Interview or Mailed Questionnaire?	9
The Two Strategies From the Perspective of the Syracuse Project	11
WHAT WE LEARNED ABOUT THE DOCUMENTATION QUESTIONS	14
Staff and Facilities	16
Program Activities	18
Program Services and Resources	22
Policy Board	24
A FIRST ATTEMPT AT AGGREGATING THE DATA	27
Teacher Center Program Activities	28
Teacher Center Services and Resources	34
Teacher Center Policy Boards	37
Teacher Center Directors and Staff	38
Summary	40
ON WITH THE TASK	40
Incentives for Participation	42
Benefits Beyond the Individual Teacher Center Project	44
APPENDICES	
A. Field Test Projects	46
B. Definition of Categories used in Tables 2, 3, and 4	48
C. One Time Only Staff and Facilities Report	52
D. Program Activity Report	57
E. Program Sources and Resources Report	60
F. Policy Board Meeting Report	62
G. Data Tables for Documentation Field Test	64

INTRODUCTION

The decision to document the development of the Teacher Centers Program was made before the first project was funded. At the time the decision was made, however, there was no attempt to specify either the content or the process for documentation activities. Rather, the Teacher Centers Program staff decided that these decisions would be best made by representatives from the projects, and should be made with the primary purpose of helping projects understand and improve Teacher Center activities, services, and resources that are made available to teachers.

Responsive service to Teacher Centers projects, however, is not the only reason to engage in documentation activities. There is a clear need to provide information to Teacher Centers Program officials so that they can explain the program to others, and build a data-based foundation of support. It is assumed that, as programs develop, solid information about the operation of Teacher Centers can be used to improve the regulations, to improve service from the national office, and to improve the State technical assistance and dissemination efforts. Finally, any professional educator who desires to improve practice in the overall field of inservice teacher education can only profit from the information gathered from a well-conceived documentation plan. The primary purpose, nonetheless, is and shall remain the development of information that will aid practitioners in operating Teacher Centers projects.

Most associated with the Teacher Centers Program are well aware of the six regional clusters that were initiated in the Fall of 1978 for the purposes of mutual support, communication, improved programming and the development of a liaison with the national office. Each cluster has a

coordinator.[1] It was these cluster coordinators and representatives from both teacher organizations that formed the working group for developing the documentation process. In a series of meetings that culminated in mid-winter, the working group developed a series of questions that would serve as the focal points for documentation activities, and narrowed the information gathering strategies to two, a mailed questionnaire and a telephone interview. Both strategies offered not only the promise of success, but the specter of specific shortcomings. Consequently, it was decided that a field test would take place during May and June, 1979 to determine which strategy was the most effective, and the most acceptable to Teacher Centers projects.

DESIGN FOR THE FIELD TEST

Eight Teacher Centers projects volunteered to participate in the field test (for a complete list of the participating projects, see Appendix A). Six of the projects sent representatives to Syracuse in April, 1979, for a full day briefing session that would prepare them to gather the information that would be required. Two projects were unable to attend, but asked if they could participate on the basis of reading the briefing materials and holding clarifying telephone conversations. The briefing sessions for the representatives from the six projects included the development of an overall understanding of the purposes of the project, an introduction to the detailed and short form questions that were to be answered, and a commitment to participate in the design

---

[1] For a complete list of the clusters, cluster coordinators, and Teacher Center Projects, see Appendix B. See Documenting Success--A Guidebook for Teacher Centers, Sally K. Mertens and Sam J. Yarger, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Albany, New York, 1979.

that had been developed (see Figure 1). A great number of clarifying questions were asked, simulation activities were provided, and the six project representatives left Syracuse with a thorough understanding of the documentation field test as well as with a great deal of enthusiasm about the potential value.

Briefly, the design called for each project to have experience with both the telephone interview and the mailed questionnaire. The two-month field test was broken into four two-week data collection periods. Four of the projects were assigned the telephone interview for the first two-week period and four were assigned the mailed questionnaire. Each project then alternated documentation strategy for the remaining three time periods. Thus, at the conclusion of the field test, each participating project had been queried on four separate occasions, twice with the telephone interview and twice with the mailed questionnaire.

It should be stressed at this point that the purpose of the field test was to assess the two data gathering strategies, and not to gather information on the eight field test projects. Consequently, a decision was made to neither aggregate nor report the data that were gathered. This decision, however, was reversed when it became apparent that, although there were flaws in the system, sufficient high quality data were available to provide a glimpse of the type of data that can be expected in the future.

Training of Interviewers

Two telephone interviewers were selected to gather data during the field test. One was a graduate student at Syracuse University, the other

Figure 1

FIELD TEST DESIGN

PROJECT	Weeks of: 4/30-5/11	5/14-5/25	5/28-6/8	6/11-6/29
	Phone	Mail	Phone	Mail
	Mail	Phone	Mail	Phone
	Phone	Mail	Phone	Mail
	Mail	Phone	Mail	Phone
	Phone	Mail	Phone	Mail
	Mail	Phone	Mail	Phone
	Phone	Mail	Phone	Mail
	Mail	Phone	Mail	Phone

Note: Forms will be mailed to Syracuse, and phone interviews will be held on the Monday following each 2 week period, i.e., 5/14, 5/28, 6/11, and 7/2.

a Syracuse Area Teacher Center staff member. The initial training was similar to that the cooperating project directors experienced. The telephone interviewers were introduced to the interview questions, and discussed these questions thoroughly. Next, possible probing questions were discussed--questions that would be necessary to elicit information that did not come through with the initial query. Finally, simulations were held with two knowledgeable professionals who do not reside in the Syracuse area. In each instance, both the interviewers and the "dummy" respondents were debriefed as to their perceptions of the process and the likelihood that miscommunication might have occurred.

The first actual field-test interviews were performed using the exact questions as in the questionnaire form with the answers being transcribed verbatim. It soon became evident that this process was both cumbersome, repetitive and time-consuming. Additionally, it was very difficult to extract the important necessary data from the multitude of interview notes that were produced.

The necessity of developing an interview checklist soon became apparent. The checklist, which evolved through several generations, allowed the interviewers to record the important data, and to know when they had achieved their goal of obtaining the data that was desired. The checklist also served the purpose of structuring the question-asking procedure, as it allowed each interviewer to know exactly where she was in the interview process, and how much had to be completed. Representatives from the field test projects were queried about program activities, resources, and services provided to teachers. The briefing packages for both the project participants and the interviewers contained specific

operational definitions of these documentation targets.

At the conclusion of each interview, both the interviewer and project director were debriefed, and suggestions for improving the process were recorded. It was through the cumulative recording of these suggestions that the final interview strategy was developed.

During both "dummy interviews" and the initial interviews using the checklist, both interviewers recorded and coded the data, while they took turns asking the questions. The data that were gathered were then compared for accuracy. By and large, both interviewers appeared to be handling the data in a similar fashion. In cases where there were discrepancies, these were discussed and solutions were found. This process led to the development of the coding categories that are used to present the data in the last section of this report (see Appendix B). Although it should be considered the least developed aspect of the documentation field test, sufficient care was taken to ensure that a fairly high degree of accuracy prevails. Quantitative techniques will be used to establish interviewer and coder reliability at the onset of the actual documentation process during the Fall of 1979.

WHAT WAS LEARNED ABOUT THE DOCUMENTATION STRATEGIES

The field test was designed to compare two data collection strategies--the mailed questionnaire and the telephone interview. These two strategies will be compared with respect to the data-collection process as well as with respect to the documentation data actually collected. This section is concerned with the relative ease of accurately reporting and collecting data with the two strategies.

Participant Perceptions of Documentation and the Field-Test Strategies

Through the cooperation of the eight project directors who participated in this study a great amount of information was collected about teacher centers. They reported on 67 different activities and on 22 different resources and services offered as established teacher center program components. They also provided information on 11 Policy Board meetings that were held in May and June and on their staffing and facilities (see Appendices C, D, E, and F for the report forms). In short, within the very tight parameters of the field test project, much was learned about teacher center programs and operations.

But most importantly, for the purposes of the field test, much was learned from these projects about the process of reporting and collecting information. The directors were informally debriefed after each data collection period. Additionally, they provided formal feedback and met as a group with the Syracuse staff at the June conference. The feedback they provided at every step of the way has been crucial in the on-going process of refining the documentation process.

In June the directors were asked if they would choose to become involved in the documentation project on a long-term basis. (If there was one question that the field test had to answer, this was it.) Seven directors reported that they would, on a voluntary basis, become involved in the long-term documentation effort. The other director also would become involved if some minor modifications in the process were made. In almost all instances the directors reported that the field-test had fostered better internal project organization. As might be expected, this better organ-

ization was primarily in the area of internal data collection. But additionally, two directors stated that the field-test had helped them to better conceptualize their actual programs. This was an unexpected benefit of the field test but in retrospect it is quite logical; it is likely that those projects who become involved in the specific data collection processes that the documentation project requires have a much better sense of what they are about. In short, it might be said that the process of documentation requires a teacher center staff to make time for "reflection."

Three of the directors reported that the field test required them to collect information they did not ordinarily collect with respect to the Policy Board, costs and staffing. However, they did not feel that this was bothersome; in other words, they saw the need for the information. This is very important to know. Obviously, the documentation project is not going to be at all successful if the directors feel that the process is meaningless. It is most important that those who become involved in documentation see the need for it and recognize the value of it for their own project purposes.

Almost all the directors saw a definite relationship between the field-test reports and other reports that are required, particularly the performance reports required at the federal level. Interestingly, two directors reported that participating in the field test had led them to re-evaluate their established data systems and they had decided these were inefficient systems by comparison to the field-test reporting format.

The directors were asked if there were any other services the Syra-

cuse project might provide in connection with the documentation project. Most unexpectedly, four out of the eight directors indicated that they would like to see the documentation project expanded in such a way as to help them with their internal evaluation processes. This was a surprise in that almost all the resistance that the documentation project encountered in its first year was based on a perceived link between documentation and evaluation. It would seem the Syracuse staff has succeeded in its effort to keep documentation separate and distinct from evaluation, which, in fact, it definitely is. But apparently, a successful experience with documentation fosters project interest in systematic evaluation procedures. While it is unlikely that the Syracuse project can develop the capacity to help other projects with internal evaluation, it is likely that those projects involved in the documentation project will have access to information that will allow them to upgrade their evaluation procedures if they choose to do so.

The information provided by the directors indicates that there is likely to be high interest in, one might even say enthusiasm for, the documentation project when it is initiated in the second year of the Teacher Centers' Program.

Telephone Interview or Mailed Questionnaire?

Which data reporting strategy did the directors prefer? Five out of the eight directors indicated equal enthusiasm for the mailed questionnaire and the telephone interview. In other words, they believe collecting project information in a systematic, organized manner is most important. Either of the strategies for accomplishing this is acceptable.

Three of the directors had a definite preference for the telephone interview. They reported that there was less time involved in that they could work from rough notes, i.e., it did not require a final, typed form. They also liked the social/professional interaction with the telephone interviewer, and noted that the telephone interview was less repetitious than the written report form. So although there was no overwhelming preference for the telephone interview there was a definite tilt in this direction with not one of the directors indicating preference for the questionnaire.

One respondent reported that it took about thirty minutes to prepare for the telephone interview, while most of the directors reported that it required about two hours. The time required for filling in the questionnaire ranged from 90 minutes to five hours with most reporting two to three hours. All directors indicated that each report required less time than those which had preceded it; the more they did it, the easier and faster it became.

It is difficult to estimate how much the preparation time can be reduced. This is, of course, related to the frequency of reporting--the more frequently a director prepares a report, the less time it is likely to consume. The directors were divided as to whether they would like to report bi-monthly (as in the field test) or monthly. Probably the best solution is to develop individual reporting schedules. Projects should be able to report as frequently as they feel is most comfortable. So long as these schedules are regular the Syracuse project should be able to handle the logistics.

The Two Strategies From the Perspective of the Syracuse Project

Again, both strategies elicited a tremendous amount of information on teacher center programs and operations. However, from the perspective of the Syracuse staff, the telephone interview was the better strategy. The mailed questionnaire ran into the same problems that have been well documented in the literature on survey techniques. Working with the most cooperative of project directors, two out of the fourteen scheduled reports were never received and two were very late. The accurate response rate then was about 70 percent.

Additionally, the written questionnaires were not so complete as the telephone interviews. Eight percent of the information requested was not available in the written questionnaires whereas only two percent of the requested information was not available in the telephone interviews.

There were also the to-be-expected problems with different interpretations of the directions and the questions in the questionnaire. For example, there were several instances of directors submitting reports for activities which were not yet completed. While this on the surface may appear to be a minor mistake, it complicated and flawed the data analysis which was supposed to be done only for "completed" activities. These types of errors compound and create errors in such calculations as "participant hours" (which will be talked about in the next section). Errors also crept in through misinterpretation of questions. For example, in one item "role group" was twice misinterpreted as "role." While this type of common misinterpretation is very easily clarified in a telephone interview, it cannot be clarified in a mailed questionnaire.

These examples are given only to illustrate the common problems with questionnaires and is not in any way meant to reflect on the abilities of the cooperating directors. Anyone who has ever conducted a survey knows there are the perennial and persistent problems with response rate and accuracy. Again our field test was conducted over a very short period of time with only most cooperative and well-trained respondents. The problems with the questionnaire could only be expected to be intensified in a large-scale, long-term effort. This is not to say that there were no problems with the telephone interview. But the interview problems are much more likely to be discovered and successfully resolved at the time of occurrence.

The biggest problem with the telephone interview was the time required. For instance, the first phone interview took almost ninety minutes. This was significantly reduced to an average of about 30 minutes in the last series of phone interviews. But the interviewers felt very pressed and rushed in trying to collect the required information in just thirty minutes. So although the interviewers worked very hard over the two-month field test period to reduce the interview time, this problem still needs some attention. Interestingly, not one of the project directors complained that the interview consumed an inordinate amount of time. It is a concern from the perspective of the Syracuse project, however, because time is directly related to the cost of conducting long-distance telephone interviews.

In the field test the dramatic drop in time required to conduct the telephone interview was accomplished by shifting from a series of specific open-ended questions and verbatim recording to broad open-ended

questions and checklist recording. Having completed the analysis of the data, it also appears that several questions can be dropped which will also reduce the time required.

The telephone interviewers had particular trouble recording information from multi-site projects. There is just too much information to process and record at one time. Developing individual reporting schedules for the various projects should alleviate this problem. It is likely that multi-site projects will simply respond more frequently, i.e., every two weeks.

There was no problem with interviewer congruence which was checked informally, but consistently and point-by-point throughout the field test. The interviewers worked together closely in continuing to refine the documentation recording language. In fact, they essentially developed the directions and language which will be used to train interviewers for next year's documentation. Rater reliability will be formally determined when permanent interviewers are trained for next year's documentation effort.

The field test yielded much information about the logistics of data reporting and collection. This information gives reason to be optimistic and excited about the potential of the Teacher Centers Documentation Project. It can be expected that project directors will be most interested in participating on a long-term basis. Although documentation definitely requires time and effort, the project directors appear to see the need for it. In fact, they see value in documentation from several different perspectives.

The process data suggest that project directors will volunteer to

participate in the documentation project whether the mailed questionnaire or the telephone interview is used. Most important, from the perspective of the directors, is that there is a systematic method for documentation. From the perspective of the Syracuse staff, however, procedural concerns are paramount since the quality of the data is directly related to the data collection process. Therefore, it is recommended that the telephone interview be used as the strategy for collecting project information in the national documentation effort.

A question that needs to be addressed prior to initiation of the ongoing effort is how many projects can the Syracuse project document well? During the field test--thanks entirely to the enthusiasm that our field test directors generated--there have been many inquiries and requests for documentation assistance. The ripple effect has been much greater than was ever hoped for, much less anticipated. The documentation effort will certainly be more powerful as a function of the number of projects that volunteer to become involved. However, it is questionable that the Syracuse project could develop, with its current level of resources, the capacity to, for example, document fifty to sixty projects by as early as Fall, 1979. In other words, the very success of year one documentation activities could potentially develop into some logistical problems in the second year.

WHAT WE LEARNED ABOUT THE DOCUMENTATION QUESTIONS

The field test was designed to answer two primary questions--one with respect to reporting and collection procedures, the other with respect to the substance of the procedures--the documentation data collected. Based

on the process or procedural data, it is recommended that the telephone interview be the strategy used for the permanent documentation effort. Much was also learned about the documentation questions and the kind of data they were capable of eliciting. The following twenty-four questions are abbreviated versions of those used in the field test:

STAFF AND FACILITIES

1. Describe the professional staff.
2. Describe the support personnel.
3. Describe the facility.
4. What resources and materials are available at the Teacher Center?
5. How accessible is the Teacher Center?

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

1. What was the activity.
2. What was it about?
3. How did the activity come about?
4. Why did teachers participate?
5. How many participants were there, and How long did they participate?
6. Describe the instructor.
7. When and where did the activity take place?
8. How was the program evaluated?
9. How much did it cost?
10. What else should we know?

PROGRAM SERVICES AND RESOURCES

1. Describe the nature of the service or resource. What is it?
2. What is it intended to do? What is the focus?
3. To what extent was it utilized?
4. How much did it cost?
5. What else should we know?

POLICY BOARD

1. When did the Policy Board meet?

2. Who came?
3. What was discussed?
4. What decisions were made?

Analyses of the documentation data collected in the field test has led to many refinements in the questioning and recording procedures. These "lessons learned" will be discussed in four sections corresponding to the four different categories of questions--1) staff and facilities, 2) program activities, 3) program services and resources and 4) policy board. All refinements and modifications that are proposed are based on the assumption that the telephone interview will be the strategy used for data collection.

Staff and Facilities

At the beginning of the field test the project directors were asked to complete a one-time-only report describing their staffs and facilities. This was a written, mailed report.

The staffing questions. The staffing questions (see Appendix C) asked the directors to describe the "professional" staff with respect to 1) primary role and tasks, 2) previous professional experience and 3) percentage of time on the teacher center project. They were also asked to describe the "support" staff with respect to 1) primary tasks and 2) percentage of time on the project.

The completeness and detail of the descriptions provided in the open-ended format varied tremendously from project to project. Furthermore, although detailed directions and definitions were provided, these were variously interpreted by the reporting directors. For example, there was some confusion regarding the distinction between "professional" and

"support" positions. From this and other instances of varying interpretations it was learned that trained recorders should make the decisions with respect to categorizing.

It is recommended that the staffing report be completed in written form prior to collecting any other project information--and that this procedure be followed up and buttressed with an in-depth telephone interview. There should be no problem in clarifying, for example, staffing information if there is an opportunity for trained interviewers to probe for more complete information.

The facilities questions. The open-ended format for describing facilities (Appendix C) also yielded information which varied greatly from project to project. From analysis of this broad range of information three categories of description emerged as relevant and useful--1) former and/or current primary useage of the space, 2) functional designation of the space, and 3) hardware available at the facility(s). A refinement of this component of documentation will involve asking directors to respond specifically in these categories.

The "accessibility" question was also open-ended and yielded descriptions that varied with respect to the dimensions considered. There was so much variance in these responses, in fact, that this documentation data could not be aggregated across the field test projects and had to be dropped from the data analysis. Although this item will be retained in the documentation plan, it was learned that this question must be asked most specifically. For example, information is needed on each school in the teacher center service area. For each school it is important to know

how much travel time (in minutes) is required (on the average, using the most common means of transportation) to travel to the center. This information will be specifically requested in the one-time written report and will be checked and clarified in the followup telephone interview. It is extremely important information at both the local and national levels and it must be accurate and interpretable across projects.

The policy board questions. Analysis of the policy board information collected in the open-ended format indicated that several types of information are available for the asking. Specifically, the policy board "formality" question (Appendix C) will be expanded and much more detail will be requested. Information is available and will be collected regarding the following areas of interest: Do members use release time to serve on the Policy Board? Are there standing committees? What types of decisions require Policy Board approval? What types of decisions can the staff make without specific Policy Board approval? Who develops the Policy Board agenda?

Summary. The most important modification to be made in improving the staff and facilities data is to follow up the written descriptions with an intensive telephone interview. This first-time interview should also be valuable in developing rapport between the project directors and the interviewer. Also, it will provide an opportunity for the interviewer to develop a broad but detailed image of how each project is organized and managed which will facilitate an understanding of the activities which are subsequently reported.

Program Activities

The project directors described the teacher center activities that

had been completed within each two-week report period (Appendix D). Overall, the data collected on these activities was of very high quality with most of the errors being errors of omission. However, every suggestion that the project directors offered for improving the documentation process was with regard to this component of the field-test with all the suggestions specifically related to eliminating repetitious questions. Repetition was a major problem with the written report. Although less irritating, it was also a problem in the telephone interview. The interviewers sometimes repeated themselves as they attempted to record, in response to open-ended questions, many bits of information almost simultaneously. The interview questions and recording forms were dramatically refined and streamlined during the course of the field-test. This problem is still a concern, however, and continues to be worked on by the Syracuse staff.

Activity details. The project directors did not encounter much difficulty in reporting the logistical details of each program activity, e.g., the who, what, where, and when, type of information. Apparently, this information is routinely logged in most teacher centers. Nonetheless, in the written questionnaire, "when" was one of the highest categories of "not available." Obviously, these were errors of omission as they did not occur in the telephone interviews.

Cost. Other activity questions, however, were not so easy to report, collect or analyze. The "cost" item was a particular problem. What should be considered as a "cost" in connection with any one activity is a question which generated much discussion throughout the field test. For example, should staff time incurred in implementing an activity be

considered? It gets even stickier if one considers costing out, for example, staff planning time. In some projects there was a tendency to paint a most cost-efficient picture; on the other hand, there was a tendency in other projects to document each and every program expense right down to the amount of coffee consumed in connection with an activity. About the only cost items that do not require constant hair-splitting are "release time" and "stipends."

It is strongly recommended that the national documentation effort collect budget information only in those categories where information can be collected accurately. To attempt to collect budget information in categories difficult to define or in categories where information is not easily available is to risk developing potentially misleading information. Based on the field test experience it is recommended that data be collected across projects only in the area of direct expenditures from federally supported teacher centers budgets, exclusive of pro-rated personnel time and materials/equipment use. Other cost data simply cannot be accurately and/or reliably gathered.

Activity evolution. Of particular interest to the Syracuse staff was the question regarding how an activity came about. Is this information accessible? All responses to this item were carefully analyzed. Although probing may be required, in most instances it can be determined what the rationale for an activity was, how the decision was made to offer a certain activity, and who promoted and developed the activity. This information can be collected with a high degree of accuracy and is potentially useful to everyone involved in teacher center program development.

Activity types. For each activity the directors were asked to indicate what it was, e.g., "workshop," "demonstration." Although there was no doubt that directors, in their own words, would be able to specify what an activity was, there was a concern as to whether this information could ever be aggregated across projects. Each response, written and verbal, was carefully analyzed. Between the second and third report periods the Syracuse staff developed a first generation checklist for recording this information. This system was used and further developed by the telephone interviewers in the third and fourth interviews. It was also used at the conclusion of the field test to categorize the written descriptions from the questionnaires.

A similar process was used to develop coding categories for describing the magnitude of intent for the various activities, i.e., the level of impact or outcomes anticipated for an activity (Appendix B). During the field test the interviewers and coders were trained to make these judgments.

Summary. The activities component of the field test was the most successful in many respects. The information was relatively easy for the project directors to obtain and report either in written or verbal form. The information was also relatively easy to categorize, code and aggregate. In aggregate form, the data present an amazingly detailed picture of what teacher centers are actively engaged in on a day-to-day basis.

There was one temporary problem, however, which should be mentioned. Initially, within the Syracuse project, the problem was dubbed the "gilding the lily" problem since in several instances it took the form of report-

ing activities which only by a stretch of logic could be considered, per the field-test directions and definitions, as teacher development activities, e.g., pot luck supper. However, it soon became apparent to the Syracuse staff that the activities in question were certainly bona fide and legitimate and that we were running the risk of becoming captives of our own definitional system. Therefore, a new category, "Services Provided to the School/Community," was developed for recording and reporting these activities. Five of the activities reported during the field test period, although they were not related to teacher development, were directly related to benefitting the school community or the community. The Syracuse staff is currently refining this reporting category which is in the most rudimentary stage of conceptualization. It should be emphasized that activities of this type are very important in many teacher center projects since the necessary base for political, school and community support is typically laid with activities of this nature. Therefore, it is most important that we learn about them. On the other hand, it is also important that we don't develop information which is misleading by attempting to justify and link each and every teacher center activity directly to the professional development of teachers. It is also important to understand that this is all right. In fact, it is essential to learn about teacher center services to the school and community which contribute to developing the climate for teacher development activities.

Program Services and Resources

The project directors were also asked to provide information regarding the services and resources that are established components of teacher center programs. These are the professional services and material or fi-

nancial resources that are available on an ongoing basis to teachers so that they may engage in independent professional development activity.

There were some initial difficulties in the field test in clarifying the distinction between "activities" and "services and resources" and especially between "services" and "staff roles and tasks." In clarifying these distinctions, the method and extent of advertising a service or resource emerged as a key dimension. It became apparent that the service or resource to be documented must minimally have a name and that teachers in the service area are specifically aware of the service or resource, i.e., teachers must have specific information as to how they can use the service or resource. These rules were used to distinguish the serendipitous from the "established." For example, in many teacher centers there are staff members who are qualified to provide consultations. In fact, much of this occurs between teachers and teacher center staff who happen to come into contact with each other, e.g., over coffee in the lounge. A decision was made, however, not to document these informal encounters as "services," even though the content may indeed relate to professional matters. This decision was made in full recognition that some would argue the "essence" of teacher centers was being ignored. The intent, however, is not to ignore--but rather to simply acknowledge that these informal professional encounters cannot be systematically documented. On the other hand, it is essential that information be collected regarding the established services and resources of teacher centers. If a teacher center has conceived, for example, a consultation service, teachers know it is available and they know how to use it, then it is very important to document its utilization.

In the field test the "service and resource" information was requested every two weeks. Since services and resources are by definition stable, this resulted in some repetition. It is recommended, therefore, that the service and resource descriptions be requested as part of the initial one-time report. Any definitional problems can then be resolved in the first intensive telephone interview. Then, in the subsequent telephone interviews, only utilization data will have to be reported and recorded.

Lest the impression be created that the field-test was a definitional battle between the Syracuse staff and the participating project directors, it must be emphasized that this was a try-out in the best sense of the term. The Syracuse staff certainly learned and there is every indication that the project directors also learned much from the process. For example, one of the field-test project staffs became particularly concerned that they had not adequately defined, for <u>their own internal purposes</u>, their services and resources and are in the process of developing a position paper on this. Another project staff became acutely aware of the fact that they had services and resources available that they had never clearly identified or advertised. So while there was some noticeable pain along the way to defining this component of documentation, everyone involved seems to have benefitted from engaging in the process.

<u>Policy Board</u>

The required teacher center governance system, the Policy Board, most clearly distinguishes the Teacher Centers Program from other staff development programs. Less is known about Policy Boards, however,

simply because they are new. The importance of this documentation component cannot be underestimated. Neither can the difficulties of developing Policy Board reporting schemes be underestimated.

Agenda. The "agenda" question (see Appendix F) consumed the most time in the telephone interviews and yielded a great amount of data that was essentially unuseable. It could not be aggregated and eventually was dropped from the data analysis. It became clear during the field test that at this time in the evolution of teacher centers more information is needed on the established structure and operations of Policy Boards and probably less information is needed on each meeting than was attempted in the field test. In other words, it is probably more important at this time to know how an item gets on the Policy Board agenda than exactly what each agenda item is. The one-time-only report has been expanded to elicit this type of structural and organizational information.

Decisions. The field test question on Policy Board decisions elicited a great amount of interesting and useable data. As with all the open-ended questions each response was carefully analyzed. As more information was collected the category and coding systems and guides for interview probing were further developed and refined. It was learned from the field-test that quite specific information can be collected with respect to three types of Policy Board decisions--"policy," "money" and "non-money." Thirteen different areas of decision making, ranging from "equipment" to "incentives," were also identified in the analysis of the field test data. It is recommended that Policy Board decisions

be the focal point of Policy Board documentation. The information is available, can be aggregated and should prove essential in understanding Policy Board operations.

An attempt was made to obtain information regarding the involvement of the various Policy Board role groups in decision making. Not only was this information virtually inaccessible, the Syracuse staff received specific feedback that this area of questioning was inappropriate. Several projects strongly believe that collecting this type of information would be dysfunctional and even harmful in some cases, particularly in those projects that are using the consensus model of decision making. Therefore, this area of questioning will be eliminated from the documentation plan.

Attendance. Interestingly and surprisingly it was difficult to get Policy Board meeting attendance data--both in written and verbal form. There is no logical explanation for this. Even with interviewer probing (and sometimes prodding) it seemed to be impossible to get exact attendance by role group. This item also had to be dropped from the data analysis. However, it is too important to drop from documentation; it is essential to know what members by role group are participating in Policy Board processes.

Hopefully, the lack of attendance data can be attributed to the fact that in most cases the directors only had the opportunity to report on two meetings and some directors only had one meeting before summer recess. If this is the case, then it can be expected that the Policy Board attendance reports will become more detailed with experience in reporting.

A FIRST ATTEMPT AT AGGREGATING THE DATA

Seveal criteria were used in making decisions regarding which question items to include in the documentation plan. Obviously, the first criterion had to do with importance of the information--Is the information requested by the question helpful in managing teacher centers, and/or in understanding teacher center operations? Another important criterion addressed availability of information--Is the information requested by the question available and can it be accurately collected? Also important was the criterion of reliability, which obviously is related to the availability of accurate information. Reliability is also related to standardization, i.e., can the information requested by the question be collected in such a way that it can be aggregated across projects? Most of the information which has been solicited by the documentation questions met all of these criteria. Those few that didn't were either dropped from the documentation plans or are in the process of being revised so that they meet the criteria in the Fall.

This section of the report will present some of the documentation data that were collected during the field test. The primary purpose here is to give examples of possible data treatment, to explore the potential of the documentation effort and hopefully to entice teacher centers to become involved in the effort. It is <u>not</u> a report on the eight projects that cooperated in the study. Yet, it is anticipated that most will find the information interesting and certainly helpful in developing at least a partial image of the Teacher Centers Program.

Before proceeding to the data analysis, it must be emphasized that the data were collected from a <u>small number</u> of projects over a <u>very short</u>

period of time. The field-test time period, May and June, was admittedly a period of limited program development for many centers, i.e., they were winding down the academic year. Furthermore, this was a field test engaged in for the sole purpose of improving the documentation process. In other words, some of the data are not as clean as they might be, and, in fact, will be during the second year of the documentation project. On the other hand, the data collected in this very limited field test are perhaps the best information currently available on teacher centers. Thus, with these mild disclaimers and some hesitation, a sample of documentation field test data will be presented.

The remainder of this section of the report will be broken into four main parts--program activities, program services and resources, Policy Boards, and directors and staff. The data will be highlighted in this analysis. All tables cited in this section can be found in Appendix G.

Teacher Center Program Activities

Program activities have been defined as scheduled, discrete, clearly discernable program components, e.g., workshops, courses, seminars, etc. It is in this area that the documentation field test gathered the most accurate and reliable information. One of the concepts that was used in analyzing these data is the "participant hour of instruction." Succinctly, a participant hour of instruction is defined as the number of participants times the number of hours of instruction per activity, e.g., four teachers attending four sessions that lasted two hours each would generate 32 participant hours of instruction (Tables 1 through 4).

A total of 12,494 participant hours of instruction were documented

in 67 activities during the two-month field test in eight teacher center projects. Interestingly, although 39 of the 67 (58 percent) activities involved one or two meetings, these short term activities generated only about 25 percent of the participant hours logged in the field-test period across projects. So although most teachers center activities are indeed short term, the participant hour measure points out that just counting activities is not enough. In fact, as this example shows, it can be very misleading. More participant hours were logged in activities that involved seven to sixteen meetings than in the short-term offerings, and clearly the most hours were generated by activities that involved three to six meetings (Table 1).

The number of activities and the resultant participant hours of instruction were also analyzed by content focus (Table 2). Interestingly, no single content focus area predominated. The largest number of activities and the greatest number of participant hours were generated in the "curricular" content focus area, with the "management of student behavior" being a close second. Other important content areas included dealing with "specific populations of students," the "act of teaching," and the "non-professional needs of teachers." No content area accounted for more than twenty percent of the participant hours of instruction.

The type of program activity was also a variable of interest (Table 3). Again, a great diversity was noted among the eight teacher center projects. With fourteen different types of program activities reported, only one, "non-traditional course," reached the twenty percent mark in the generation of participant hours, and only four others above ten percent--"traditional course," "interactive workshop," "mini conference,"

and "curriculum development."

Finally, the participant hours of instruction data were analyzed by what is referred to as the "magnitude of activity intent," i.e., the strength of the outcomes that were anticipated (Table 4). About one-third of the participant hours of instruction were generated in areas that are either professionally or personally "facilitative," i.e., although educationally or personally relevant, no concrete and specific outcome was anticipated. Over one-half of the participant hours were generated in the area that is referred to as "program/skill development." In this instance, activities were designed to provide teachers with the ability to do something in their classrooms that they had not been able to do before. Less than twenty percent of the participant hours were accounted for in the areas referred to as "program modification" and "program restructuring." Both of these categories call for role changes either on the part of teachers, or on the part of teachers and other school personnel. They represent greater magnitudes of intent, and are more closely aligned to what most think of when the term "school change" is used. Thus, it seems that for the most part, teacher center program activities are generated with the idea of either providing teachers with useable skills, or helping to facilitate a teacher's personal and/or professional growth.

Data were also gathered on the source of an idea for the development of a program activity (Table 5). As those who would support teacher centers would expect, by far and away the greatest initiators of ideas were teachers themselves. This happened through direct teacher-initiated request, through formal needs assessment, through staff-initiated informal

needs assessment, and through the success of prior programs. To a lesser extent, other sources were also identified such as a mandated State initiative, teacher center staff recommendation, or administrator recommendation.

The decision to offer an activity was usually the result of a decision made by the teacher center staff (Table 6). To a much lesser degree, Policy Boards made that decision. It would appear that, even during the first year, some distinction is being made between operational and policy decisions, with the Policy Boards either supporting or promoting the right of the staff to make specific programmatic decisions. A corollary to this was noted in the area of who actually promoted or developed the activities, with the teacher center staff performing that function in the great majority of cases (Table 7).

A variety of means were used to advertise program activities (Table 8). Newsletters and special fliers are the most prevalent, with word of mouth a distant second. In slightly less than half of the cases, it was not possible to determine how activities were advertised.

Teacher centers do have facilities! This became clear when a determination was made about where teacher center activities take place (Table 9). Approximately half of them occur in a teacher center facility, with slightly less than one-fourth of them occurring in school buildings. It should be noted that in some cases teacher center facilities are located in school buildings. A very small number of activities take place on campuses or in other facilities.

It would appear as though teacher center activities have not divested themselves of many of the traditional incentives for participa-

tion (Table 10). The great bulk of the activities carried either credit toward certification, university credit, or district credit toward salary increment, or some combination thereof. To a lesser degree release time was provided and direct stipends were paid, while in many cases teacher interest alone was the primary incentive for participation (teacher interest is an inference made when no real or concrete incentive can be identified).

While the majority of teacher center activities take place after school, a significant minority occurred during school hours (Table 11). To a much lesser degree, evenings and weekends were reported as times for teacher involvement in teacher center activities.

Although slightly less than one-half of the activities were targeted for teachers in general, a significant minority of other target groups were mentioned as well (Table 12). In some cases elementary teachers were specified, in other cases secondary teachers were targeted for program activities. Additionally, subject area teachers, preservice teachers, and administrators were mentioned on occasion.

There appears to be a variety of personnel who are instructing or facilitating teacher center program activities (Table 13), while over half of those mentioned were either teachers or teacher center staff members--a healthy sign for centers. Mentioned less frequently, but still often enough to be important, were professors and professional consultants. School administrators, state education department representatives, and others were mentioned far less frequently.

While teacher centers do evaluate their program activities, they tend to do so in a fairly standardized manner (Table 14). A standard

questionnaire is used about five times more frequently than any other single technique, and the next most frequent form of evaluation is an informal verbal exchange. To a lesser extent, narrative evaluations are used as are state evaluation forms. A variety of other formats such as interviews and the testing of participants are used infrequently. If evaluations tend to be standardized, followup evaluation tends to be almost non-existent (Table 15). In over 70 responses to that query, only six distinct followup activities were mentioned, and half of those relied on the perceptions of participants. It would appear that the followup evaluation of teacher center activities will be an area for future growth in teacher centers.

Developing a reliable understanding of the cost of teacher center activities is very difficult (Table 16). A word of caution is necessary concerning the data that are reported here. Teacher centers that participated in the field test were asked to report only the direct expenditure of grant funds other than those used for already employed staff and previously purchased materials and equipment, e.g., ditto paper and typewriters. Thus, the available data are conservative indeed. With that in mind, it is important to note that the most frequent cost for teacher center activities is instructional fees, with training materials occurring about half that often. However, instructional fees are about ten times as expensive as training materials. Stipends are offered rarely, but when they are offered, they are quite costly. Interestingly, release time was mentioned on only four occasions, and the average cost was only $270 per activity.

Not only do teacher center activities tend to be one or two meeting

affairs, they tend to occur over a relatively short time span (Table 18). Approximately two-fifths of the activities reported occurred within the time span of a single day. Roughly another one-fourth occurred over a period of a week, with the next most frequent occurrence (10 out of 67) being between five and seven weeks. It would appear that those participating in teacher center activities prefer short term instructional experiences as opposed to longer, more traditional course formats. "Short term," however, should not be interpreted as lacking in intensity. Sixteen of the 67 reported activities were two hours in length, with twelve lasting three hours (Table 19). Only eleven of the activities were briefer than two hours, while 24 lasted 3½ hours or longer. The longest event reported was seven hours in duration.

Finally, teacher center activities are not high-enrollment affairs (Table 20). Nearly half of the activities enrolled between six and fifteen students, with eight enrolling five or less. Only sixteen of the 67 activities enrolled more than 25 students. One can assume that the relatively small enrollments suggests the opportunity for a great deal of participant interaction and individualized help for teachers.

Teacher Center Services and Resources

As reported earlier, gathering accurate information on teacher center services and resources proved to be quite difficult. This occurred for at least two reasons. First, most teacher center directors probably have not thought of the distinction between services and resources, and have not thought about them in the context of differentiation from scheduled program activities. This conceptualization is an artifact of the documentation plan, and therefore requires some restructuring in the

manner in which respondents think about their programs. Secondly, because questions in this area were breaking new ground in conceptualizing teacher center activities, they were not asked as clearly as they will be in future efforts. Specifically, they were asked in the open-ended format with no specific probing until very late in the field-test period, and then only in the telephone interviews. These defects have been recognized and are being accounted for in future efforts. Still the data that were gathered on teacher center services and resources are worthy of note. These data should, however, be viewed as very conservative, and probably not totally reflective of the rich array of services and resources that are available in teacher centers. For example, nearly everyone is aware of the fact that more than one of the eight responding teacher centers has a newsletter.

Regardless of the data limitations, the field-test sites were able to document many different physical facilities that are available for participants to use (Table 21). Twelve professional libraries were reported, as were eight curriculum libraries and eight work spaces for the development of materials. Further, seven of the centers reported administrative offices, while four reported rooms for teachers to hold meetings. To a lesser degree, lounge areas and computer space were reported.

Teacher centers also report an amazing amount of equipment available for teachers to use (Table 22). Thirteen laminators were reported in the eight participating projects. Eight photo copiers were reported with lesser numbers of duplicators, typewriters, and dry mount presses. Finally, two or fewer centers reported computer terminals, videotape equipment, thermofax machines, book binders, microfiche readers, and

photography equipment.

Teacher center staff provide a variety of services (Table 23). Three projects report teacher center staff as available for assisting teachers to develop curriculum materials. Two centers report general professional development assistance available to teachers, a system for matching teachers with other human resources, and a delivery system so materials can be made available to teachers in their classrooms. Interestingly, demonstrations were mentioned in only one project and that occurred only twice. Classroom observations occurred frequently, but again only in a single project.

Teacher center resources are utilized in a variety of ways as well (Table 24). Two projects reported that their material development laboratories were used over a thousand times during the field-test period. The one project that reported a lending library also reported it was used nearly 200 times during the two-month period. Finally, the two projects that lend either materials or equipment reported 50 utilizations during the field-test period. Finally, the two projects that have drop-in centers note that they were utilized over 30 times during the field test period. Again, it should be mentioned that the field test period took place in May and June, a time period when teacher centers are winding down their yearly activities.

Some teacher centers offer financial resources to teachers (Table 25). Three projects offer incentive or mini grants, and used them over 100 times during the field test period. Travel for professional development and release time for visitation was mentioned infrequently, but this may well be a defect in the documentation process rather than a true re-

flection of what is occurring in teacher centers.

Teacher Center Policy Boards

If the eight teacher center projects that volunteered to participate in the field study are any indicator of the rest of the teacher centers, then teachers enjoy much more than a simple majority of membership on Policy Boards (Table 26). The mean number of teachers on the Policy Boards in the eight projects was about 15, and teachers enjoy about a 2½ to one majority of representation. There tend to be more elementary teachers than secondary teachers, and more central office administrators than building administrators. There are insufficient data to make any judgments about higher education representation, even within the eight projects.

During the two-month field test in eight projects, there were eleven Policy Board meetings (Table 27). Of the eleven meetings, three of them were held during the school day, four after school in the afternoon, and four in the evening. Over half of the meetings lasted approximately two hours (Table 28). One meeting lasted one hour and four lasted three hours. Thus, it appears that one could state that in the eight participating projects during May and June of 1979, Policy Boards met about every month and a half, and the meeting lasted a little over two hours.

Interestingly, it became apparent to the interviewers that it is not always possible to gather such seemingly routine data as attendance at Policy Board meeting by role group, and specific agenda items. Thus, an effort was made to probe the respondents in the eight projects concerning the decisions that were made, rather than those that were scheduled to be discussed. The data that are to be represented here should

be considered an underestimate of what occurred. The problems that were encountered are being accounted for in the Fall documentation process.

During the two-month field test period, the interviewers were able to document 57 Policy Board decisions made during the eleven meetings (Table 29). That amounts to about five decisions per meeting. Eighteen of the 57 decisions were the establishment of policy, while the remainder focused on specific details rather than more general policy. Eleven of the 57 decisions were directly related to the expenditure of funds.

The largest single category in which decisions were made was "program." Seven specific decisions were made that did not require the authorization to expend funds, while four required the approval to use teacher center financial resources. Interestingly, 19 of the 57 decisions focused on how the Policy Board itself operates. One questions whether that is a high number when one considers that Policy Boards have been operating for almost a year. Regardless, it appears that Policy Boards do meet, that they do establish policy, and that they do make specific decisions.

Teacher Center Directors and Staff

One phase of the documentation process is to gather basic information about the project director and the center staff. These data are gathered on a "one-time-only" basis, and upgraded only as changes are made. These data do, however, offer a first glimpse of teacher center directors and staff, at least in the eight participating projects.

The respondents were asked to cite the primary and other responsibilities for both project directors and staff (Tables 30 and 31). Clear-

ly, the project directors spent the greater bulk of their time in the hiring and supervision of staff, with the development and implementation of program a strong second. Other responsibilities that were cited as primary for the director were preparation and management of the budget and dissemination activities.

Staff other than the director, on the other hand, devoted practically no time to staff matters. They, however, like the directors expend a great deal of their efforts on the development, implementation, and evaluation of program activities. Unlike the directors, the center staff appear to spend a much greater proportion of their time delivering service to teachers such as consultations, demonstrations, and so on.

Teacher center directors held a variety of positions before becoming affiliated with the program, while the other professional staff tended to come from the teaching ranks (Table 32). Two of the eight directors were school administrators, and two were school supervisors. One was a classroom teacher, one was a federal program administrator, one was a university professor, and one was a teacher center director prior to the initiation of the federally sponsored project. On the other hand, twelve of the 23 staff came directly from classroom positions. Three were supervisors, two were university professors, three were graduate students, and three were education consultants. It would appear that classroom teachers are more likely to move into teacher center staff positions than they are into the position of project director.

Non-professional staff spend the great bulk of their time fulfilling clerical roles. However, on some occasions they deal with materials and equipment (Table 33).

Finally, it became apparent that the size of the staffs in the eight teacher centers that were participating in the field test were quite varied (Table 34). Most of the teacher centers had only one or two support (non-professional) positions, although one had five. In terms of number of professional positions, they were much more varied. Two projects had two professional positions; another two projects had five. One project had only one professional position, another project had ten. It would appear that one will not be able to describe teacher centers very well by the size of the staff.

Summary

Once again, the caution must be made that these data are tentative and most conservative. They were collected from only eight volunteer projects, for only two months during the school year when project activities are typically at a low ebb. The program activity data is clearly more accurate than the data on services and resources. Certain types of Policy Board information that one would think would be easily obtained, is not. Regardless, these data do present as accurate a picture as is currently available on teacher centers, and even more importantly, offer those who might be interested in becoming involved with the documentation process a glimpse of the type of data that can be generated.

ON WITH THE TASK

This report has focused on the experiences and the lessons learned in the documentation field test. It also has presented a glimpse of the first attempt to aggregate the documentation data. By nearly any standard, it was a successful field test. Not only did the process provide valuable information that can be used to improve next year's "on-line" effort, but also it provided important, though sketchy, baseline informa-

tion about teacher centers.

More importantly, however, each of the eight projects that participated in the field test completed the activity with as much enthusiasm as they exhibited when they began. In fact, all eight project directors have indicated a desire to become involved next year in a more extensive and long-term documentation process. Hopefully, the enthusiasm generated by the eight participating projects will characterize other projects as well. It would be a pleasant problem to be faced with more projects desiring to become involved with the documentation process than could be accommodated.

Although both the telephone interview and the mailed questionnaire strategies for gathering information have potential, the data clearly suggest that the telephone interview is the most promising approach to documentation. Although it is more costly, it is more reliable, more complete, more personal, and appears to put a slightly lower amount of strain on the respondent. Consequently, the telephone interview will be the documentation strategy of choice for future activities.

The field test was also successful for another very important reason. Many flaws in the data gathering process were encountered. Adjustments were made as the field test progressed, and as that occurred, more fine tuning was found to be necessary. At the conclusion of the field test, the documentation staff was able to develop a final and fairly complete list of the major problems to be encountered and flaws to be overcome prior to the initiation of an on-line process during the next academic year. At this point, most of the problems have been corrected. In some cases, developmental work is still occurring that will

allow for the possibility of gathering other important information in a reliable and accurate fashion. However, some of the information that was desired was found to be unavailable, or too difficult to obtain. In those cases, and they are relatively rare, specific items have been dropped for future activities.

Currently, plans call for the Syracuse Area Teacher Center documentation project to be ready in the Fall of 1979 to begin assisting projects in a systematic documentation process. Involvement in this process will, of course, be completely voluntary. In fact, because of limitations in both human and fiscal resources, there is a strong possibility that not all projects who desire to become involved will be able to be accommodated. Certainly, the project staff will strain to its utmost to accommodate as many teacher center projects as possible.

Incentives for Participation

At the onset of the field test, everyone suspected that there were benefits to be derived from involvement in the documentation process that focused on improved program operations. Subsequently, after in-depth discussions with those who participated, the beliefs were confirmed. Specifically, project directors reported that involvement in the field test helped them organize and manage their projects in a much more systematic fashion. In fact, on more than one occasion, project directors reported they had to think about things that had not previously been encountered. Thus, one clear benefit, is the use of the documentation process as a project management tool.

Additionally, it was reported that thinking about project activities, services, and resources almost automatically put project personnel

into a planning mode. As projects discovered what was occurring, they immediately thought about what should occur and began planning activities to ensure that it happened. Thus, the documentation process can be used as a planning device.

By virtue of the fact that each project will receive its own data in aggregate form on a periodic basis, there is little question that the documentation process can be used to generate information for dissemination. Not only will this appeal to project staff, Policy Boards, and school officials, but it will also be appealing to those at the state education agency level who have responsibility for disseminating project activities. At the same time, and perhaps associated with dissemination, the data generated for each individual project and reported to that project should be invaluable in completing the required progress reports for the Teacher Centers Program office. At this time, staff from the documentation project are working closely with the national staff in an effort to integrate the documentation process with the progress report forms. Hopefully, that task will be accomplished in the not-too-distant future.

Finally, and this is a decision to be made by each local project, the documentation data can clearly be used for evaluative purposes. It should be stressed that no evaluation of any project will be forthcoming from the Syracuse Area Teacher Center. In fact, data from this project office will be presented only in aggregate form. However, with the individual data that will be reported to each participating project, it is apparent that the evaluation of project performance is likely to be a natural outcome.

Benefits Beyond the Individual Teacher Center Project

There are benefits beyond local teacher center projects to be derived from this documentation process, and they should be considered as well. First, and perhaps foremost, documentation of a federal program that is performed in a manner where comparable data are gathered across many projects, has rarely, if ever, been done in the past. In this instance, we would not only be gathering helpful data about a federal program, but we would be developing important information about one approach to inservice education.

Obviously, these data could be used by staff members from the national office, by state education officials, and by a variety of professional organizations to analyze teacher centers, and to substantiate their worthiness for continuation. There can be little doubt that the data generated during the field test could be very supportive in many ways of future growth for teacher centers. Actually, there is little risk involved since there is virtually no information with which to compare information that are gathered from teacher centers. Although it is the suspicion of the Syracuse Area Teacher Center documentation project staff that teacher centers would stand up well when compared with other programs, it is unlikely that this comparison can be made. In other words, being the only program that has clear information that is both accurate and reliable concerning project efficacy would place the Teacher Centers Program in a unique and powerful position.

Finally, the documentation information can be used to improve the profession. That may sound like a lofty goal, but it is apparent that most professionals involved with teacher centers are serious about their

work in teacher education. And, anyone who is serious about their profession can only benefit from clear information such as the information being gathered in the documentation process. Fundamental questions regarding governance, delivery formats, incentives, and others can be entertained with actual data--a condition that has not prevailed in the past. Clearly, the improvement of teacher center activities specifically, and inservice teacher education in general, can almost be considered to be a natural outcome of an understanding of the type of information that can be generated over a relatively long period in the teacher center documentation process.

Thus, it's on with the task. The task does involve some commitment, and some effort. Our best estimate is that any teacher center project can adequately and accurately become involved with somewhere between four and eight hours of investment per month. Hopefully, those who have read this report and are considering the possibility of involvement, will not consider that too great an investment to make.

Appendix A

Field Test Projects

Sally Vogel, Director
Mid-Coast Teacher Center
Box 860
Camden, Maine 04843

Beth Sauerborn, Associate Director
Syracuse Area Teacher Center
400 Huntington Hall
Syracuse University
150 Marshall Street
Syracuse, New York 13210

Wade Scherer, Director
Washington West Resource Center
Old Post Office, RFD 1
Box 172 N
Waitsfield, Vermont 05673

Howard Knopf, Director
Atlanta Area Center for Teachers
3000 Flowers Road, South
Atlanta, Georgia 30341

Jean Owen, Director
Teacher Center of SPEC
619 Wall Street
Alvermarle, North Carolina 28001

Sadie Shropshire, Director
Gary Teacher Center
Beckman Middle School
1403 West 23rd Avenue
Gary, Indiana 46407

Linda Bardonner, Director
The Teacher Center for Gallatin County
615 South 16th Street
Boxman, Montana 59715

Bob Lukes, Director
Western Montana Teacher Center
301 West Alder
Missoula, Montana 59801

Appendix B

Definition of Categories used in Tables 2, 3, and 4

Included in this Appendix are shortened versions of the definitions that were developed to code program activities during the field test. They are included in this report in an effort to help the reader better understand the meaning of the data. Complete operational definitions were developed, but were determined to be too cumbersome for inclusion in this report. Additionally, further development is occuring, and it is expected that prior to the initiation of the "on line" documentation process in the Fall of 1979, still more refined definitions will be in use.

CONTENT FOCUS

Curricular--Curricular activities focus on the development of understanding and/or skills in areas directly related to academic curricula, e.g., math, reading, social studies, metrics, etc.

Specific population of students--These activities were directed toward helping teachers better deal with a variety of different types of children, e.g., handicapped, gifted, bilingual, middle school.

Organization/management of instruction--Activities in this area were focused on instructionally related classroom skills, but did not include actual skills for teaching children. Rather, they focused on helping teachers to organize and manage the instructional process, e.g., individual diagnosis, processes for individualized instruction, record keeping, organizing learning centers, evaluation, etc.

Management of student behavior--While the last category focused on the development of instructional skills, activities in this area focused on the development of skills for dealing with children. They may or may not have been instructionally directed, but they were clearly directed toward greater teacher efficacy in working with students, e.g., motivation, classroom climate, dealing with deviant behavior, classroom communication skills, classroom meetings.

Act of teaching--Activities in this area focused directly on helping teachers develop specific instructional skills, e.g., questioning skills, lesson presentation, teaching strategies, etc.

General teacher education--Activities in this area dealt with professional education, but not with directly applicable skills. In a sense, they represent activities designed to provide foundations or underpinnings that should allow teachers to better understand and utilize specific skills, e.g., human development, philosophy, psychology, research methodology.

Professional needs of teachers--Activities in this area are related to the needs of teachers as professionals, but not to professional content. In a sense, they deal with the organizational and societal concerns that teachers develop by virtue of being a member of the teaching profession, e.g., occupational stress, coordination of support personnel, working with parents.

Non-professional needs of teachers--Activities in this domain dealt with needs that teachers stated, but appeared in no way to be related to education, teaching, or foundational growth. They reflect, in a sense, the personal interests of teachers, e.g., tennis, pottery, belly dancing, hair styling.

Materials, media, and equipment--Activities in this area focused on either the development of or the use of materials, media, and equipment, e.g., making teacher games, using a film series, using video equipment in the classroom.

TYPES OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Interactive workshop--This is usually a short term activity focused on developing specific skills, understanding or awareness. There may or may not be an expert facilitator of the activity, and the essence is usually informal. Interaction among participants is typically highlighted.

Materials development workshop--This is usually a short term group activity not unlike an interactive workshop, but with the expressed goal to develop materials. It is usually a "hands-on" type of workshop with a product(s) to take back to the classroom.

Speaker/lecture series--Typically this is one or more sessions where an expert(s) delivers a lecture designed to provide knowledge. There is little interaction among participants, and the activity is more likely to be arranged for large groups.

Traditional course--A traditional course usually has some type of credit attached to it, has a multi-session commitment, a pre-arranged content focus, and predetermined requirements for participants. It is not unlike a traditional university course.

Mini course--A mini course is similar to a traditional course, only it is typically of shorter term with a more narrowly defined course. It is also less likely to be credit bearing, and less likely to be didactic. nature.

Non-traditional course--A non-traditional course is frequently set up within the framework of a traditional course, i.e., a multi-session commitment. However, the focus of the course is likely to be individualized and/or personalized, the requirements are likely to be evolutionary, and there are typically many more options for participants than in a traditional course.

Seminar--A seminar typically has an expert facilitator, with more interaction intended among the participants than in a "lecture." However, there would not be as much interaction as one would expect in an "interactive workshop." The atmosphere is more likely to be formal and the content usually has an academic or intellectual focus.

Mini conference--A mini conference is typically a short term, intensive large group event. It usually is focused on one general topic but may encompass a variety of activities or components. It would not be unusual for participants to have the option of selecting one or two from among several sessions to attend.

Demonstration--In this type of activity, an expert or experienced professional models a specific teaching skill or strategy. The expert may also model a non-teaching classroom skill, but the essence is on demonstrating or modeling some skill that teachers can use.

Teacher center awareness--This is a type of activity that is unique to newly emerging teacher centers, and probably will not be in existence as the years go by. Specifically, it is an activity designed to introduce teachers to the teacher center, and to the types of professional growth opportunities that are available to them.

Curriculum development--As opposed to materials development which tends to be individual, a curriculum development activity usually is a committee or group of professionals working together to modify existing school curriculum, or to develop new curriculum.

Other--This type of activity would include all of those which could not be categorized in any of the preceding areas.

MAGNITUDE OF INTENT

Facilitating--This kind of teacher education program may be characterized as almost "goal-less." Rather, it is likely to be planned with the clear intent of exploring new approaches to education, or providing (facilitating) client growth and understanding in a variety of ways. Facilitative programming can either focus on professional topics, or one can explore and seek facilitative programming in personal areas, e.g., exploring how an individual is perceived by his/her colleagues.

Program/skill development--The intent of this type of program is to alter the educational program or to aid educational personnel in developing new skills or improving existing ones. Typically, one can think of program or skill development programming as "fine tuning" existing school programs, or helping teachers develop new skills that readily fit into their day to day activities. It typically requires little if any alteration of either professional roles or organizational structure.

Program modification--The skills learned in this more radical type of programming tend to be more molar than molecular, and require more individual commitment to implement. Although this type of programming requires role changes on the part of the teacher, few, if any, major organizational changes are required. In other words, although the school will look very much the same, the things that teachers are doing in their classrooms may differ in important ways.

Program restructuring--Not only does this type of program call for major role changes on the part of educational personnel; it typically implies notable organizational change as well. Thus, institutional leaders and administrators must make a commitment to this type of programming in the same way that teachers must. A much wider base of role groups will participate in restructuring programs, and a thorough understanding of the effect as well as a commitment for institutional tolerance must exist. Not only will the activities in a classroom be markedly changed by program restructuring, but the organization of the school will appear different as well.

Appendix C

One Time Only Staff and Facilities Report

STAFF AND FACILITIES

PROFESSIONAL STAFF POSITION #1: _____

Primary role and tasks: _____

_____

_____

_____

Previous job title and years in last position: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project: _____

PROFESSIONAL STAFF POSITION #2: _____

Primary role and tasks: _____

_____

_____

_____

Previous job title and years in last position: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project: _____

(continued through six positions)

SUPPORT STAFF POSITION #1:_____

Primary tasks:_____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project:_____

SUPPORT STAFF POSITION #2:_____

Primary tasks: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project:_____

SUPPORT STAFF POSITION #3:_____

Primary tasks: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project:_____

SUPPORT STAFF POSITION #4:_____

Primary tasks: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project:_____

SUPPORT STAFF POSITION #5:*_____

Primary tasks: _____

_____

Percentage of time on Teacher Center project:_____

*If more than five support staff positions, please develop similar form.

DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE THE TEACHER CENTERS FACILITY #1
(If more than one facility, please provide a description for each permanent site.)

DESCRIBE THE RESOURCES AND MATERIALS AVAILABLE AT THIS FACILITY
(If more than one facility, please provide this description for each site.)

WHAT IS THE ACCESSIBILITY OF THIS FACILITY TO TEACHERS IN THE SERVICE AREA?

THE POLICY BOARD

NUMBER OF POLICY BOARD MEMBERS BY ROLE GROUPS

TEACHERS

Elementary_____

Secondary _____

Other _____

ADMINISTRATORS

Building _____

Central Office_____

Other _____

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Professors_____

Administrators _____

Other _____

OTHER _____

ROLE GROUP OF CHAIRPERSON? _____

_____

HOW OFTEN ARE MEETINGS CONVENED? _____

_____

DESCRIBE THE DEGREE OF FORMALITY OF POLICY BOARD MEETINGS _____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix D

Program Activity Report

PROGRAM ACTIVITY REPORT (title):_____

1. DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE THE MANNER IN WHICH THE PROGRAM ACTIVITY WAS EXPERIENCED BY THE CLIENTS.

2. DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE WHAT THE PROGRAM ACTIVITY WAS ABOUT.

3. DESCRIBE THE WAY IN WHICH THE PROGRAM ACTIVITY EVOLVED FROM THE INITIAL IDEA TO ITS ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION.

4. DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE THE INCENTIVES THAT MAY HAVE LED TEACHERS OR OTHER EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ACTIVITY.

5. PROVIDE AS MANY OF THE DETAILS AS POSSIBLE ABOUT PROGRAM DURATION AND NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS.

6. DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE ALL THAT YOU CAN ABOUT THE PERSON OR PERSONS OFFERING INSTRUCTION IN THE ACTIVITY.

7. PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS YOU CAN ABOUT THE WHEN AND WHERE OF THE ACTIVITY.

8. DESCRIBE AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE ABOUT HOW THE PROGRAM ACTIVITY WAS EVALUATED.

9. CAN YOU PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION THAT WILL HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW MUCH THE ACTIVITY COST?

10. PLEASE PROVIDE US WITH ANY OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE ACTIVITY THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE NOT ELICITED AND THAT YOU THINK WOULD BE HELPFUL.

Appendix E

Program Sources and Resources Report

SERVICE AND RESOURCE REPORT FOR (name):_____

1. DESCRIBE AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE THE MANNER IN WHICH THE SERVICE OR RESOURCE IS PROVIDED.

2. DESCRIBE THE FOCUS OF THE SERVICE OR RESOURCE.

3. PROVIDE AS MANY DETAILS AS POSSIBLE ABOUT THE UTILIZATION OF THE SERVICE OR RESOURCE.

4. PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION YOU CAN THAT WILL HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW MUCH THE SERVICE OR RESOURCE COST.

5. PLEASE PROVIDE US WITH ANY OTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE ACTIVITY THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAVE NOT ELICITED AND THAT YOU THINK WOULD BE HELPFUL.

Appendix F

Policy Board Meeting Report

REPORT OF POLICY BOARD MEETING (Meeting #____)

1. GIVE THE DATE AND TIME DURATION OF THIS POLICY BOARD MEETING.

2. GIVE THE ATTENDANCE AT THE MEETING BY ROLE GROUP. USE RATIOS.

3. LIST THE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA AND/OR THE ITEMS THAT WERE DISCUSSED. PLEASE LIST IN THE ORDER DEALT WITH.

4. LIST THE DECISIONS MADE BY THE POLICY BOARD, WHETHER THEY WERE POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE. TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, PROVIDE DETAILS THAT WILL ALLOW US TO BETTER UNDERSTAND WHICH ROLE GROUPS ARE SUPPORTING OR NOT SUPPORTING SPECIFIC DECISIONS.

Appendix G

Data Tables for Documentation Field Test

Table 1.

Number of Meetings, Participant Hours of Involvement and Percentage of Participant Hours by Number of Activities.

Number of Meetings	Number of Activities	Participant Hours	Percent of total Participant hours
1 or 2	39	3138	25.1
3 to 6	15	4951	39.6
7 to 16	8	3155	25.3
25	1	1250	10.0
not available	4		
Total	67	12494	100.0

Table 2.

Number of Activities, Participant Hours of Involvement and Percentage of Participant Hours by Content Focus

Content Focus	Number of Times Content Focus Mentioned*	Number of Activities**	Participant Hours	Percent of Total Participant Hours
Curricular	19	12.5	2409	19.3
(not available)		2		
Specific population of students	12	7.7	1407	11.3
(not available)		1		
Organization/Management of instruction	7	3.3	418	3.3
Management of Student Behavior	5	3.7	2012	16.1
Act of teaching	4	2.3	1400	11.2
General teacher education	5	5	926	7.4
Professional needs of teachers	7	5.5	852	6.8
(not available)		1		
Non-professional needs of teachers	11	9.8	1375	11.0
Materials	11	5.5	473	3.8
Media/Equipment	8	7.5	1222	9.8
Total	89	67	12494	100.0

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because multiple content foci were sometimes associated with an activity

** Figures were adjusted to account for number of content foci named per activity

Table 3.

Number of Activities, Participant Hours of Involvement and Percentage of Participant Hours by Type of Activity

Type of Activity	Number of Activities	Participant Hours	Percent of Total Participant Hours
Interactive Workshop	8	1261	10.1
Materials Development	8	468	3.7
Speaker/Lecture Series	10	1163	9.3
(not available)	1		
Traditional Course	5	2118	17.0
Mini Course	7	1216	9.7
Non-traditional Course	8	2579	20.6
Seminar	4	450	3.6
Mini-conference	5	1510	12.1
Demonstration	2	249	2.0
Teacher Center Awareness	2	27	.2
(not available)	1		
Curriculum Development	2	1320	10.6
(not available)	1		
Other	2	133	1.1
(not available)	1		
Total	67	12494	100.0

Table 4.

Number of Activities, Participant Hours of Involvement and Percentage of Participant Hours by Magnitude of Intent

Magnitude of Intent	Number of Activities	Participant Hours	Percent of Total Participant Hours
Facilitative/ personal	13	2073	16.6
Facilitative/ professional	12	1846	14.8
(not available)	1		
Program/Skill development	36	6413	51.3
(not available)	2		
Program Modification	1	1250	10.0
(not available)	1		
Program Restructuring	1	912	7.3
Total	67	12494	100.0

Table 5.

Source of Idea for Program Activity

Source of Idea	Number of Activities
Teacher initiated request	22
Staff initiated informal needs assessment	9
Formal needs assessment	12
Teacher Center grant	2
Mandate condition	3
Success of earlier program	6
Policy Board initiative	1
Teacher Center staff recommendation	6
Administrator recommendation	7

Table 6.

Decision Process for Offering Activities

Decision Process	Number of Activities
Teacher Center staff decision	26
Policy Board decision	9
Policy Board Subcommittee decision	1
Specified in grant	1
Not available	30
Total	67

Table 7.

Source of Promotion and/or Development for Activities*

Who	Number of Activities
Teacher Center staff	52
Policy Board member	1
Teacher	9
Administrator	3
Committee	6
Consultant	1

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because multiple role groups were sometimes associated with promotion/development of an activity.

Table 8.

Method for Promoting Activities*

Means of Advertising	Number of Activities
Newsletter	14
Special flyer	15
Word-of-mouth	6
Phone calls	1
Letters	1
Local media	2
Not available	30

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because multiple forms of advertisement were sometimes associated with an activity.

Table 9.

Site for Implementation of Program Activities

Site	Number of Activities
School building	14
Campus	3
Teacher Center	38
Municipal facility	2
Community facility	2
Not available	8
Total	67

Table 10.

Incentives for Participation in Program Activities*

Incentives	Number of Activities
Certification	18
University credit	11
District credit	15
Released time	6
Stipend	5
Teacher Interest	17
Social/travel opportunity	1
Inservice Day	2
Not available	1

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because multiple incentives were sometimes associated with an activity.

Table 11.

Time of Day Program Activities Occur

Time	Number of Activities
During school hours	15
After school	29
Evening	7
Weekend	3
School closed for Activity	1
Summer	1
Not available	1
Total	67

Table 12.

Client Groups Specified as Recipients for Program Activities*

Client Groups	Number of Activities
Teachers in general	33
Beginning teachers	1
Preservice teachers	5
Elementary teachers	8
Secondary teachers	7
Teachers in specific school(s)	2
Subject area teachers	8
Aides	2
Administrators	2
Community Representatives	3

* Figures do not total number of activities because some activities had multiple target populations.

Table 13.

Instructor/Facilitator for Program Activities*

Instructor/Facilitator	Number of Activities
Classroom teacher	14
Teacher specialist	7
Teacher Center director	9
Other Teacher Center staff	20
Professor	17
Professional consultant	15
School administrator/supervisor	3
Community member	1
Graduate student	1
State Education Department consultant	1
Commercial sales representative	1

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because some activities had multiple facilitators.

Table 14.

Procedures for Evaluating Activities*

Evaluation Procedures	Number of Activities
Informal verbal interaction	8
Planned evaluation discussion	3
Interviews	1
Standard Teacher Center questionnaire	37
Activity Specific Questionnaire	3
State evaluation form	7
Narrative evaluation	5
University evaluation form	2
Testing of participants	1
Not available	2

* In several activities more than one method of evaluation was used.

Table 15.

Follow-Up Evaluation of Activities*

Follow-Up Procedures	Number of Activities
Perceptions of participants	3
Testing of students	1
Classroom consultations	2
Nothing specific	53
Not available	11

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because multiple followup activities were sometimes associated with an activity.

Table 16.

Number of Activities, Range and Mean of Costs by Category

Cost Category	Number of Activities	Range	$\bar{x}$
Training materials	14	$2 to $305	$54
Instructional fees	28	$30 to $7320	$582
Stipends	5	$150 to $1125	$556
Release Time	4	$60 to $480	$270
Participant travel	2	$5 to $50	$27
Refreshments	4	$3 to $50	$124
No cost specific to the activity	19		

* Figures do not equal total number of activities because costs for an activity were sometimes placed in more than a single category.

Table 17.

Number of Meetings Per Teacher Center Activity

Number of Meetings	Number of Activities
1	28
2	11
3	4
4	2
5	4
6	5
7	1
8-12	4
13-16	3
17-20	0
21-25	1
Not available	4
Total	67

Table 18.

Time Span for Completion of Teacher Center Activities

Time Span	Number of Activities
1 day	28
2 days	8
3-7 days	6
8-14 days	1
15 days to 4 weeks	3
5 weeks to 7 weeks	10
8 weeks to 11 weeks	2
12 weeks to 15 weeks	3
16 weeks to 19 weeks	3
7 months	1
Not available	2
Total	67

Table 19.

Length of Meetings for Teacher Center Activities

Length of Meetings	Number of Activities
One hour	3
One and one-half hours	8
Two hours	16
Two and one-half hours	4
Three hours	12
Three and one-half hours	3
Four hours	4
Five hours	9
Six hours	4
Seven hours	1
Not available	3
Total	67

Table 20.

Number of Participants Engaged in Teacher Center Activities

Number of Participants	Number of Activities
2 - 5	8
6 - 10	20
11 - 15	11
16 - 20	3
21 - 25	9
26 - 30	7
31 - 35	1
36 - 40	3
41 - 45	1
46 - 50	2
Greater than 50	2
Total	67

Table 21.

Purposes for Which Space is Designated
in Eight Teacher Center Projects*

Space designated for--	Total number designated in 8 Teacher Center Projects
Curriculum library	8
meetings	4
administrative offices	7
using equipment	8
professional library	12
developing materials	8
using computers	2
lounge area	1
video taping	1

* Figures do not equal total number of projects because most projects reported more than one designated purpose for use of space.

Table 22.

Type and amount of equipment available in eight Teacher Center Projects*

Equipment	Total number available in 8 Teacher Center Projects
laminator	13
duplicator	6
thermofax	2
electric typewriter	5
photocopier	8
VTR equipment	2
Computer terminal	2
Microfiche reader	1
Dry mount press	3
book binder	2
kiln	1
darkroom	1
photography equipment	1

* Figures do not equal total number of projects because projects reported more than one type and/or amount of equipment.

Table 23.

Services Provided By Teacher Center Staff

Service Available:	Number of projects offering	Utilization during Field Test Period
Demonstrations	1	2
Observations	1	79
Curriculum Development Assistance	3	15
Videotaping	1	1
Professional Development Assistance	2	28
Classroom Advising	1	18
Matching teachers with human resources	2	44
Matching teachers with material resources	1	31
Delivery of materials	2	49
"Hotline" support	1	7
Computer search	1	89
Newsletter Distribution	1	600

Table 24.

Resources Provided by Eight Teacher Center Projects

Resources Available:	Number of Projects Offering	Utilization Field Test Period
Library (lending)	1	192
Scrounge Center	1	6
Materials Development Lab	2	1014
Materials (lending)	2	48
Equipment (lending)	1	6
Use of equipment	2	33
"Drop in" Center	2	33

Table 25.

Financial Resources by Eight Teacher Center Projects

Financial Resources:	Number of Projects Offering	Utilization Field Test Period
Incentive grants	3	111
Travel for professional development	1	3
Release time for visitations	1	4

Table 26.

Role group membership on Policy Board in Eight Teacher Center Projects

Role Groups	Average ($\bar{x}$) number of members
Teachers	
Elementary	8.7
Secondary	5.2
Other	1
Administrators	
Building	.5
Central Office	2.4
Other	.6
Higher Education	
Professors	1
Administrators	1
Other	
Other	.5
Total	21.6

Table 27.

Time of Policy Board Meetings in Eight Teacher Center Projects

Time	Number of Meetings
During School Day	3
After School	4
Evening	4
Total	11

Table 28.

Length of Policy Board Meetings in Eight Teacher Center Projects

Length	Number of Meetings
One hour	1
Two hours	6
Three hours	4
Total	11

Table 29.

Frequency of Policy and Other Decisions Concerning Center and Policy Board Operations Made by Policy Boards

Teacher Center Operations	Set Policy for	-Specific Decisions- Non-money Items	Money Items
Conference attendance	2		1
Other travel			1
Equipment			2
Materials	2		
Program		7	4
Release Time	2		
Staffing	1	5	
Teacher grants	2		1
Instruction	1		1
Facilities	2	1	1
Public Relations/Dissemination		1	
Teacher Incentives	1		
POLICY BOARD OPERATIONS			
Operating Budget	5		
Establish committee		6	
Representation (Liaison)		1	
Bylaws		1	
Meetings		3	
Grants (to write)		2	
Officers		1	

Table 30.

Frequency of Project Director's responsibility by task in Eight Teacher Centers*

Task Categories	Primary Responsibility	Some Responsibility	Task Categories	Primary Responsibility	Some Responsibility
Teacher Center general management	3		Media and Equipment - e.g., procurement distribution		
Field Satellite Sites - general management	1	1	Services to teachers - e.g., consultations, demonstrations, materials/curriculum development, computer searches	1	
Program - e.g., development, implementation, evaluation, research	8	2	Budget - e.g., preparation of, management of	5	
Program Activities - specific coordination	3	2	Dissemination - e.g., newsletter, product development	5	
Facilities - maintenance of e.g., libraries, media, etc.		1	Policy Board - e.g., recommendations to attends meetings, chairs meetings	3	1
Staff - e.g., hiring, supervision release time	11		Liaison - e.g., to teacher groups, to LEA, to IHE	2	
Material Resources - e.g., development, dissemination	2		Other - e.g., development of proposals	1	
Human Resources - e.g., identification of, matching	1				

* In some instances a single project checked more than one task per category. Thus, the entries do not necessarily represent separate projects.

Table 31.

Frequency of Task responsibility for staff other than director in Eight Teacher Centers*

Task Categories	Primary Responsibility	Some Responsibility	Task Categories	Primary Responsibility	Some Responsibility
Teacher Center general management	1		Media and Equipment - e.g., procurement distribution	1	
Field/Satellite Sites - general management	3		Services to teachers - e.g., consultations, demonstrations, materials/curriculum development, computer searches	7	1
Program - e.g., development, implementation, evaluation, research	9	5			
			Budget - e.g., preparation of, management of		2
Program Activities - specific coordination	5	1			
Facilities - maintenance of e.g., libraries, media, etc.	1		Dissemination - e.g., newsletter, product development		
Staff - e.g., hiring, supervision, release time		3	Policy Board - e.g., recommendations to attends meetings, chairs meetings	1	
Material Resources - e.g., development, dissemination	5	1			
			Liaison - e.g., to teacher groups, to LEA, to IHE		
Human Resources - e.g., identification of, matching		1			
			Other - e.g., development of proposals		1

* In some instances a single project checked more than one task per category. Thus, the entries do not necessarily represent separate projects.

Table 32.

Title of Position held by Teacher Center Personnel During Previous Year

Title	Project Director	Other Professional Staff
Classroom teacher	1	12
School administrator	2	
School supervisor	2	3
Federal program administrator	1	
University professor	1	2
Teacher Center Director	1	
Graduate student		3
Education consultant		3

Table 33.

Frequency of Task reponsibility for support staff in Eight Teacher Centers

Tasks	Full-time support staff	Part-time support staff
Clerical	8	
Materials and Equipment	3	4
Operation of Teacher Center Faculty (s)	1	

Table 34.

Number of professional and support staff positions in eight teacher center projects.

Number of positions	Professional positions	Support Staff positions
1	1	3
2	2	4
3	1	
4	1	
5	2	1
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	1	